

Appl. No. 10/629,081
Amdt. dated January 19, 2005
Reply to Office action of July 21, 2004

REMARKS

Enclosed is new Declaration in compliance with MPEP § 602.01 and 602.02.

The rejection of claims 6 and 7 is rendered moot by the cancellation of those claims.

Claim 1 has been replaced with new claim 9.

Claims 1-3 and 5-7 were rejected as being unpatentable over Bencriscutto. This rejection is respectfully traversed. Independent claim 1 has been replaced by claim 9. Claim 9 calls for a ridge member having an uppermost planar surface between the convex outer side wall and the concave inner side wall. The claim also states that the uppermost planer surface extends between an upper end and a lower end and slopes downwardly towards the concavity from the convex outer side wall to the concave innerside wall. No such arrangement is suggested in Bencriscutto since his ridge member is semicircular, does not have upper and lower ends, and does not slope in the claimed manner.

Claims 1-5 were rejected as being unpatentable over Turnbull. This rejection is respectfully traversed. The reference does not suggest the claimed ridge member having concave inner and outer side walls with an uppermost planar surface extending between an upper and a lower end.

Appl. No. 10/629,081
Amdt. dated January 19, 2005
Reply to Office action of July 21, 2004

Claim 8 was rejected as unpatentable over the above references in view of Boyce. Since parent claim 9 is patentable for the above reasons, dependent claim 8 is also patentable.

For these reasons it is submitted that this application is now in condition for allowance.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No.34584US1.

Respectfully submitted,
PEARNE & GORDON LLP

By: 
Thomas P. Schiller, Reg. No. 20677

1081 East 9th Street
Suite 1200
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108
(216) 579-1700

January 19, 2005